

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/702,428	ARAI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marc S. Zimmer	1712	

All Participants:
Status of Application: allowed

 (1) Marc S. Zimmer

(3) _____

 (2) Deborah Herzfeld

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 6 July 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

 Rejection(s) discussed:

 Claims discussed:

 Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Applicant was advised of the following outstanding issues that needed to be amended before an allowance could be issued:

(i) In claims 9 and 19, to say that a monomer having the vinyl radical "contains" styrene implies that a styrene residue makes up a fraction of a larger molecule. This is inconsistent with the language of the Specification (see paragraph 29) and, frankly raises doubts as to what Applicant is trying to claim. It is, therefore, once again submitted that "contains" should be replaced with "is". If Applicant seeks coverage of a wider array of vinyl materials than they might consider inserting Markush language that refers to the individual monomers set out in paragraph 29. (It should be appreciated that "allyl and acryl" are not descriptions of compounds but rather are residues of a larger compound and, hence, should not be members of said Markush group. Furthermore, 3-fluorinated ethylene and 4-fluorinated ethylene should be re-identified as trifluoroethylene and tetrafluoroethylene.

(ii) The method of claim 14 is not supported by the original Specification and needs to be rewritten. Applicant is referred to paragraphs 28 and 33 and the description under test sample 2 where it is made clear that, in fact, the polymer (molecular structure) is derived from all three of these monomers wherein they are all copolymerized at once, not in sequence as the claim suggests. It is only after said copolymerization that the polymer is modified by reaction with a strong acid. The Examiner therefore recommends that claim 14 be amended to claim a method entailing introducing a strong acid functional group into a polymer derived from the vinyl radical and the two monomers expressed by way of structural formulae (It is believed that this mistake was the result of Applicant trying to normalize the language of claims 4 and 14 but this is not feasible given that the divinyl-diorganylsilane is not reacted only after the vinyl monomer and vinyltriorganylsilane are reacted.)

(iii) Speaking of claim 4, the phrase "the formula being" should be moved directly above the formula itself.

(iv) In claim 20, it should be made clear which monomer is being further limited since there are three monomers recited in claim 14 by inserting the phrase "expressed by a formula" after the word "monomer" followed by the formula for the organosilicon compound bearing a vinyl group and R4, R5, and R6 groups. Also in claim 20, there is no such thing as vinyl tris silane and it is suspected that this was intended to be "vinyl tris(trimethylsiloxy) silane". See claim 10.

Applicant indicated that they were amenable to addressing the issues in the manner proposed by the Examiner..